



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,307	12/12/2003	Steven Johnson	840468605001	4351
41498 7590 02/01/2008 RUDOLPH J. BUCHEL JR., LAW OFFICE OF P. O. BOX 702526 DALLAS, TX 75370-2526			EXAMINER NEGRON, WANDA M	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/735,307

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON, STEVEN

Examiner

Wanda M. Negrón

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16, 17 and 19-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16, 17 and 19-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the amendment filed on 11/19/2007, the claim objections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 33 and 41-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 33 recites the limitation "the wireless access point" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed claim 33 was intended to be depending on claim 32, and has been treated as such for the remainder of this Office action. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 41 recites "a monitor control device" comprising a data port, a modulator, a demodulator and a memory recited in lines 22-28. It is unclear whether this is intended to be the same as or different from the data port, modulator, demodulator and memory recited in lines 6-12.

Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16, 17 and 19-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zustak et al. (US Pre-Grant Application Publication 2002/0104098 A1), hereinafter referred to as Zustak, and further in view of Kuwano et al. (US Patent No. 6,456,320 B2), hereinafter referred to as Kuwano.

Regarding **claim 1**, Zustak discloses a device (100) for implementing video surveillance (see paragraph [0042], lines 1-10) on an existing coaxial network, i.e. a conventional coaxial cable television network (see paragraph [0017], lines 1-13), wherein the existing coaxial network supports data transmitted over a first carrier signal, i.e. upstream data via cable modem (see paragraph [0030]), a second carrier signal, i.e. out-of-band downstream data (see paragraph [0024], lines 5-7), and a plurality of other carrier signals, i.e. in-band downstream conventional RF broadcast television channels (see paragraph [0024], lines 10-11), the device comprising a data port, i.e. the interface point connecting the transmission medium 20 to the set-top box 22 (see figure 2), for connecting to the existing coaxial network; a modulator, i.e. a DOCSIS cable modem (see paragraph [0030]), for modulating first digital signals, i.e. electrical signals from a digital camera (332), onto the first carrier signal, wherein at least some of said first

digital signals represent sensory electrical signals, i.e. electrical signals from the sensor in the digital camera (332) representing a visual; a demodulator (106) for demodulating second digital signals off the second carrier signal; a memory (176) for storing data (see paragraph [0019], lines 1-12); a video sensor, i.e. a digital camera (332), for capturing image frames of a surveillance area and converting said image frames to video sensory electrical signals; and a video processor, i.e. a graphics processor (136), for receiving the video sensory electrical signals. Zustak, however, does not explicitly teach that the data to be stored in said memory are sensory electrical signals as data, a motion detector for detecting motion in at least a portion of the surveillance area and issuing a motion indication, and that the video processor also determines which image frames to save in the memory based on receiving a motion indication.

Kuwano, on the other hand, discloses a memory wherein sensory electrical signals are stored as data, i.e. digital recording device 204, a motion detector, i.e. monitoring control device 206, for detecting motion in at least a portion of the surveillance area and issuing a motion indication (see col. 6, lines 3-28 and step 56 in figure 11), and a video processor, i.e. monitoring control device 206, for determining which image frames to save in the memory based on receiving a motion indication (see col. 8, lines 33-40 and figure 11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the motion detection capability of Kuwano by integrating the video processor, the memory and the motion detector of Kuwano to the device taught by Zustak because recording would be minimize thus decreasing the memory

used, and a supervising individual would only be alerted when necessary (Kuwano at abstract).

Regarding **claim 2**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses an output port, i.e. the interface point connecting set-top box 22 to TV 24 (see Zustak, figure 1), for outputting at least said plurality of other carrier signals, i.e. TV video and audio.

Regarding **claim 3**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that said memory stores a plurality of instructions (see Zustak, paragraph [0019], lines 1-12), and logic circuitry, i.e. a CPU (132), said logic circuitry operably coupled to said memory for responding to and processing at least some of said plurality of executable instructions (see Zustak, figure 2).

Regarding **claim 4**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses an output port, i.e. the interface point connecting set-top box 22 to TV 24 (see Zustak, figure 1), for outputting at least said plurality of other carrier signals, i.e. TV video and audio.

Regarding **claim 5**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a second modulator (144). It would have been inherent to use a switch electrically coupled between said data port, said output port, and said second modulator in order to provide the transmission path required by the user, i.e. watching TV, accessing the Internet, sending information to the service provider, viewing e-mails, etc.

Regarding **claim 6**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a user interface for converting user interacts to electrical signals, i.e. a remote control (36), a keyboard, a mouse or joystick (see Zustak, paragraph [0031])., said user interface operably coupled to said logic circuitry (see Zustak, figure 2 and paragraph [0033]).

Regarding **claim 7**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that said logic circuitry is a **central processing unit**, i.e. a CPU (132).

Regarding **claims 8 and 9**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that said first carrier signal, i.e. upstream data via DOCSIS cable modem (see Zustak, paragraph [0030]), is an upstream data over cable service interface specification (DOCSIS) carrier, which conventionally operates on a carrier frequency between 0 MHz and 50 MHz.

Regarding **claims 10 and 11**, Zustak discloses that said second carrier signal, i.e. out-of-band downstream data (see Zustak, paragraph [0024], lines 5-7), is a downstream data over cable service interface specification (DOCSIS) carrier, which conventionally operates on a carrier frequency between 500 MHz and 1000 MHz.

Regarding **claim 12**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that at least some of said plurality of other carrier signals, i.e. in-band downstream conventional RF

broadcast television channels (see Zustak, paragraph [0024], lines 10-11), which conventionally operate on carrier frequencies between 50 MHz and 750 MHz.

Regarding **claims 14 and 16**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a second sensor for receiving second sensory inputs and for converting said second sensory inputs to second sensory electrical signals, i.e. monitoring control device 206 (see Kuwano, figure 10) which receives the digitized image data and outputs a monitoring signal when motion is detected (see Kuwano, col. 8, lines 33-40), wherein said logic circuitry, i.e. a CPU, responds to and processes said second sensory electrical signals for controlling said sensory electrical signals (see Kuwano, col. 8, lines 33-40 and figure 10).

Regarding **claim 17**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a tuner for tuning one carrier signal of said plurality of other carrier signals, i.e. an in-band and out-of-band tuner (104) including a tuner for conventional RF broadcast television channels (see Zustak, paragraph [0024]), said tuner coupled to said output port, i.e. raw data outputted by the tuner is transmitted by way of the system bus or directly through the graphics processor (see Zustak, paragraph [0032]) to the interface point connecting set-top box 22 to TV 24 (see Zustak, figure 1); and a display, i.e. a TV (24), for displaying a representation of information on said one carrier signal of the at least said plurality of other carder signals, i.e. displaying a tuned TV channel, said display coupled to said tuner.

Method **claim 19** is drawn to the method of connecting the apparatus claimed in claim 1 to a standard interactive cable TV system. The surveillance device described in lines 7-19 has limitations similar to those treated in the rejection of the apparatus claimed in claim 1, and are met by the reference as discussed above. In addition, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses connecting said apparatus to an existing coaxial network, i.e. a conventional coaxial cable television network (see Zustak, figure 1, 3, and paragraph [0017], lines 1-13). It is inherent that an interactive conventional coaxial cable television network, as described by Zustak, would have a head-end node (10) and a plurality of distribution nodes, wherein the existing coaxial network supports data transmitted over a first carrier signal, i.e. upstream data via DOCSIS cable modem (see Zustak, paragraph [0030]), a second carrier signal, i.e. out-of-band downstream data (see Zustak, paragraph [0024], lines 5-7), and a plurality of other carrier signals, i.e. in-band downstream conventional RF broadcast television channels (see Zustak, paragraph [0024], lines 10-11).

Zustak as modified by Kuwano also discloses connecting a surveillance device, i.e. the system comprising camera 332, set-top box 312 and TV 322, to each of at least some of the plurality of distribution nodes, i.e. the distribution nodes that would be inherently located between the head-end 10 and the user premises 302, 304, 306, 308. It would be inherent to connect a second demodulator at the head-end node in order to demodulate the upstream data, and to connect a second modulator at the head-end node modulator for modulating out-of-band downstream data.

In addition, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses capturing a first image frame from the surveillance area, converting the first captured image frame to video sensory electrical signals, capturing a second image frame from the surveillance area, converting the second captured image frame to video sensory electrical signals, receiving a motion indication, and saving the second captured image frame to the memory (see Kuwano, col. 5, line 44 – col. 6, line 33, and col. 6, lines 48-54). Zustak as modified by Kuwano also discloses modulating the video sensory electrical signals representative of the first captured image frame onto the first carrier signal, and transmitting the video sensory electrical signals onto the existing coaxial network, i.e. uploading images of a monitored remote property to the service provider as upstream data via DOCSIS cable modem (see Zustak, paragraph [0042]).

Regarding **claim 20**, it would be inherent to connect a network server to the second modulator and the second demodulator at the head-end node to provide for addressability by the head end (see last sentence of paragraph [0016]).

Regarding **claim 21**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that the motion detector is incorporated in the video processor, i.e. monitoring control device 206 of Kuwano determines motion based on the analysis of two image frames and also sends a monitoring control signal to record the images if motion is detected (see figure 10 and col. 8, lines 33-40), and the video processor compares image frames for changes indicating the presence of motion between capture of the image frames (see Kuwano,

col. 6, lines 3-54); the method further comprising comparing a second captured image frame to the first captured image frame for changes indicating the presence of motion in the surveillance area, and issuing a motion indicator (see Kuwano, figure 10 and col. 6, lines 3-54).

Regarding **claim 22**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses measuring an amount of change between the second captured image frame and the first captured image frame (see Kuwano, col. 6, lines 3-20); and comparing the measured amount of change to a predetermined threshold amount of change (see Kuwano, col. 6, lines 21-33).

Regarding **claim 23**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that the motion detector is incorporated in the video processor, i.e. monitoring control device 206 of Kuwano determines motion based on the analysis of two image frames and also sends a monitoring control signal to record the images if motion is detected (see figure 10 and col. 8, lines 33-40). Official notice is taken that the concept and the advantage of extracting motion detection information on the basis of the difference between a region of interest within two image frames is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of indicating motion on the basis of the difference between a region of interest within two image frames to the method taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano

because ordinary events, e.g., an operating ceiling fan, would not trigger a false monitoring signal.

Regarding **claim 24**, official notice is taken that the concept of sending/receiving a transmission error when a video sensor cannot transmit a video image and the concept of storing in a memory the last transmitted video before the transmission error occurred is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to improve the method taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano by including a step for storing the previous image frame when a transmission error has occurred while transmitting the current image frame in order to preserve the last known image captured since a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp if this leads to an anticipated result.

Regarding **claim 25**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that the motion detector is incorporated in the video processor, i.e. monitoring control device 206 of Kuwano determines motion based on the analysis of two image frames and also sends a monitoring control signal to record the images if motion is detected (see figure 10 and col. 8, lines 33-40), and the video processor compares image frames for changes indicating the presence of motion between capture of the image frames (see Kuwano, col. 6, lines 3-54).

Regarding **claim 26**, official notice is taken that the concept and the advantage of extracting motion detection information on the basis of the difference between a region of interest within two image frames is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of indicating motion on the basis of the difference between a region of interest within two image frames to the method taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano because ordinary events, e.g., an operating ceiling fan, would not trigger a false monitoring signal.

Regarding **claim 27**, official notice is taken that the concept and the advantage of discarding image frames wherein the comparison for obtaining motion information resulted in not detecting motion is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the capability of discarding image frames wherein the comparison for obtaining motion information resulted in not detecting motion to the device taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano because the number of computing operations would be minimized since the first image frame would only be replaced by a second image frame when motion is detected.

Regarding **claim 28**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that the video processor selects at least some image frames for storage in the memory based on an

amount of change detected between a current frame and a previous image frame being above a predetermined threshold amount of change (see Kuwano, col. 6, lines 3-33).

Regarding **claim 29**, official notice is taken that integrating a video processor as a physical component residing in a video sensor is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to improve the device taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano by integrating the video processor with the video sensor in order to minimize the number of physical components since a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp if this leads to an anticipated result.

Regarding **claim 30**, official notice is taken that the concept of triggering video surveillance recording on the basis of an activation of an RFID reader is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to improve the device taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano, by integrating an RFID reader in order to trigger a recording event when activated, since a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp if this leads to an anticipated result.

Regarding **claim 31**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a universal serial bus port (154) (see Zustak, figure 2).

Regarding **claim 32**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a wireless access point for sending and receiving wireless signals (see Zustak, paragraph [0021]).

Regarding **claim 33**, official notice is taken that IEEE 802.11, Wireless Personal Area Network (WPAN), Bluetooth, HOME Radio Frequency (HomeRF) and HIPERLAN standards are well known in the relevant art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to improve the device taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano by making the device compliant to one of IEEE 802.11, Wireless Personal Area Network (WPAN), Bluetooth, HOME Radio Frequency (HomeRF) and HIPERLAN standards since a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp if this leads to an anticipated result.

Regarding **claim 34**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses an infrared (IR) sensor for receiving infrared signals (see Zustak, paragraph [0033]).

Regarding **claim 35**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a remote user interface for receiving user commands (see Zustak, paragraph [0033]).

Regarding **claim 36**, official notice is taken that the concept and the advantage of having a remote controller with a key for disabling a video sensor is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include the capability of having the user remotely disable an active video sensor because the user could deactivate the image sensor in order to minimize power consumption.

Regarding **claim 37**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a medical monitoring device port, e.g., a USB port (154) (see Zustak, figure 2).

Regarding **claim 38**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses an RF output port (see Zustak, paragraph [0021]), video output port (166) and audio output port (see AUDIO OUT in figure 2).

Regarding **claim 39**, it would be inherent to have a data bus for carrying video information from the video sensor. Official notice is taken that the concept of a data bus for carrying video information which is compliant with one of a digital video standard, NTSC video standard, Agile RF NTSC standard, RF Agile digital video standard, DSL telephone standard and USB standard is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to improve the device taught by Zustak as modified by Kuwano by making the data bus compliant with one of a digital video standard, NTSC video standard, Agile RF NTSC standard, RF Agile digital video standard, DSL telephone standard and USB standard since a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp if this leads to an anticipated result.

Regarding **claim 40**, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses that the video sensor further comprises a quasi night vision sensor for operating in low light (see Kuwano, col. 14, lines 22-37).

Regarding **claim 41**, Zustak discloses a coaxial network, i.e. a conventional coaxial cable television network (see Zustak, paragraph [0017], lines 1-13). In addition, the surveillance control devices described in lines 4-20 have limitations similar to those treated in the rejection of the device claimed in claim 1, and are met by the reference as discussed above. Although Zustak as modified by Kuwano does not explicitly disclose having a plurality of said surveillance control devices, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of said surveillance control devices in a system for implementing video surveillance because more than one locations could be monitored.

Additionally, Zustak as modified by Kuwano discloses a monitor control device coupled to the coaxial network, i.e. a site 306 having playback capability (see Zustak, paragraph [0042]) and a set-top box 316, which is an example of how a set-top box 22 could be set up, comprising a data port, i.e. the interface point connecting the set-top box 316 to the service provider head end 10 (see figure 3), for connecting to the coaxial network; a video output port, i.e. output port 166 for playback on television 326 of video transmitted; a modulator for modulating first digital signals onto the first carrier signal, i.e. a DOCSIS cable modem (see paragraph [0030]), which would be inherently coupled

to the data port in order to properly transmit electrical signals; a demodulator (106) for demodulating second digital signals off the second carrier signal, which would be inherently coupled to the data port in order to properly receive electrical signals; a memory, i.e. recording device 336; and a video monitor, i.e. television 326, coupled to a video output port, output port 166.

Zustak as modified by Kuwano also discloses a head-end (10), comprising a cable modem termination system (see Zustak, paragraph [0042] and [0044]) for receiving first digital signals on the first carrier signal and transmitting second digital signals on the second carrier signal; and a temporary storage, i.e. a media server 12, for storing image frames of a surveillance area, i.e. uploaded programming from a subscriber including images of a property (see Zustak, paragraph [0042] and [0044]).

Claims 42-53 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 25-30, 40, 37, 32, 33, 35 and 36 respectively, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Monroe (US Application Publication No. 2003/0025599 A1) teaches a method for identifying the occurrence of an event from a remote location wherein identification occurs when motion is detected using two whole/partial image frames.
- Myers (US Application Publication No. 2002/0163577 A1) discloses a video monitoring system wherein a scene is recorded when motion is detected.
- Kogane et al. (US Patent No. 6,323,897 B1) teach a monitor camera unit including a motion detector to detect motion from video data wherein video data is stored in response to motion detection.
- Lazo et al. (US Application Publication No. 2004/0105006 A1) disclose a monitoring system wherein a RFID reader is used to keep track and identify assets associated to an RFID tag.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wanda M. Negrón whose telephone number is (571) 270-1129. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30 am - 4:00 pm alternate Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/735,307
Art Unit: 2622

Page 20

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Wanda M. Negrón/

Examiner, Art Unit 2622
January 29, 2008

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Ometz', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER